

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/045,316	NAKAMARU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Peter J. Lish	1754	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Peter J. Lish. (3) Paul Carango.  
 (2) Stuart Hendrickson. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 15 November 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hassan reference.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The showing of unexpected results by the use of sulfur within the applicants claimed range was discussed. In order to show unexpected results, results from the reference must be compared with the applicants results. It was discussed that the method of forming the iron sulfide on the surface of the iron powder is responsible for these differing results. Alternatively, placing the method of making the iron-sulfur particles as a limitation in the claims, which will require further search may overcome the applied reference.